

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ BLACK BORDERS
- ☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- ☐ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- ☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
- ☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
- ☐ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
- ☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
- ☐ OTHER: \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.

124



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/900,186	07/09/2001	Kouichi Narahara	R2184.0106/P106	5750

24998 7590 09/10/2004

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP  
2101 L STREET NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20037-1526

EXAMINER

HILLERY, NATHAN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/900,186

Applicant(s)

NARAHARA, KOUICHI

Examiner

Nathan Hillery

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4, 5, 7, 11, 12 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/9/01.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Application filed on 7/9/01.
2. Claims 1 – 51 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 10, 20, 35, 50, and 51 are independent.

### *Priority*

3. Applicant is advised of possible benefits under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), wherein an application for patent filed in the United States may be entitled to the benefit of the filing date of a prior application filed in a foreign country.
4. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.
5. Should applicant desire to obtain the benefit of foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) prior to declaration of an interference, a translation of the foreign application should be submitted under 37 CFR 1.55 in reply to this action.

### *Claim Objections*

6. Claims 4, 5, 7, 11, and 12 are objected to because of the following informalities: the claims each recite "further comprising the step," which already exists in the parent claim(s); the appropriate phrase would be to use "wherein the step ..." so as to clearly illustrate to the reader the further limitations put on it. Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1 – 5, 10 – 14, 20 – 24, 29 – 32, 35 – 40 and 46 – 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brobst et al. (US 6061700 A).

9. **Regarding independent claim 20**, Brobst et al. teach that *the method and apparatus of the present invention has particular applicability to formatting web pages on the Internet ... A user that wishes to access information on the Internet 170 typically has a computer workstation 200 that executes an application program known as a web browser 210. Under the control of web browser 210, workstation 200 sends a request for a web page over the Internet 170 (Column 2, lines 54 – 61) and that a web server computer system 220 executes a web server application 222, monitors requests, and services requests for which it has responsibility. When a request specifies web server 220, web server application 222 generally accesses a web page corresponding to the specific request, and transmits the page to the user's workstation 200 (Column 3, lines 5 – 11), which provide for **inputting document information composed of a plurality of elements, from a document information source (Internet)**. Brobst et al. also teach that according to the present invention, an apparatus and method for formatting a specified group of related web pages into a single web page is disclosed. A user defines a number of selected pages and associated relation criteria for each selected page. A formatting mechanism collects the URLs for the selected pages and those related pages based on the relation criteria and stores the URLs in a URL container. The formatting mechanism further invokes each web page associated to the URLs contained in the URL container and generates a conglomerate page. The conglomerate*

*web page may include data insert into or referenced in one or more of the selected pages. The conglomerate web page may then be printed using a standard browser print function (Column 1, line 66 – Column 2, line 12), which provide for **evaluating a degree of significance (relation criteria) of each element included in said document information; and generating an output document (conglomerate web page), on which a plurality of selected elements are placed in the decreasing significance order.*** Brobst et al. do not explicitly teach a **decreasing significance order**. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to be motivated to use the invention of Brobst et al. to provide for **selecting an element among said plurality of elements in a decreasing significance order**, since Brobst et al. do teach that *the relation criteria is an important element in the formatting process because it defines the requisite association that must exist between a number of URLs to be deemed "related" URLs and therefore defines which pages to include in the flattened page (Column 5, lines 33 – 37).* Thus, the skilled artisan would be motivated to modify the invention so that the users retrieve only the information set by their criteria.

10. **Regarding dependent claims 21, 22 and 36**, Brobst et al. teach that *because apparatus 500 flattens many lined web pages into a single conglomerate web page, the standard print function supplied with any browser will print the conglomerate web page. The function of mechanisms 540-560 may best be understood with relation to the flow diagram of FIG. 6 (Column 6, lines 48 – 53), which provide for **outputting said output document to an image outputting device or an image transmission device, that said image outputting device is a printing device or a display device, and said***

**image transmission device is a facsimile device, and an output unit outputting said document information whose information content is reduced, to a storage device (Fig 1.180).**

11. **Regarding dependent claims 23 and 24**, Brobst et al. teach that *suitable relation criteria for relating URLs include: whether or not the URLs are on the same web server; whether a specific search word appears in the web URLs search list; whether there is a link between the URLs; or whether the URLs have the same base address* (Column 6, lines 1 – 5), which provide that **said evaluation unit evaluates the degree of significance for said each element included in said document information, based on significance defining information described in said document information, and that said evaluation unit evaluates the degree of significance for said each element included in said document information, based on a fixed significance-evaluating standard.**

12. **Regarding dependent claim 46**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 29, and is rejected along the same rationale.

13. **Regarding dependent claim 47**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 30, and is rejected along the same rationale.

14. **Regarding dependent claims 29 – 32, 48 and 49**, Brobst et al. teach that *referring to FIG. 1, a computer system 100 in accordance with the present invention includes a processor 110, a main memory 120, a mass storage interface 140, and a network interface 150, all connected by a system bus 160. Those skilled in the art will appreciate that this system encompasses all types of computer systems: personal*

*computers, midrange computers, mainframes, etc. Note that many additions, modifications, and deletions can be made to this computer system 100 within the scope of the invention. Examples of possible additions include: a computer monitor, a keyboard, a cache memory, and peripheral devices such as printers (Column 3, lines 43 – 54), which provide that **said document- information processing device includes said document information source (Internet), said document- information processing device is connected to said document information source through a network, said document- information processing device includes said image outputting device or said image transmission device (a computer monitor ... and peripheral devices such as printers), said document- information processing device is connected to said image outputting device or said image transmission device through a network, said document- information processing device includes said storage device, said document- information processing device is connected to said storage device through a network.***

15. **Regarding independent claim 35**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 20, and is rejected along the same rationale.

16. **Regarding dependent claim 37**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 23, and is rejected along the same rationale.

17. **Regarding dependent claim 38**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 24, and is rejected along the same rationale.

18. **Regarding dependent claims 39 and 40**, Brobst et al. teach that *how these attributes are processed depends on the relation criteria specified by the user... the*



*user may specify a relation criteria that includes all URLs that have the FOLLOW attribute, excludes those that have a NOFOLLOW attribute, and excludes those that have a SHOULD FOLLOW attribute. In yet another alternative, URLs with a FOLLOW or SHOULD FOLLOW attribute are included in the conglomerate web page while the URLs that have the NOFOLLOW attribute are expressly excluded (Column 10, lines 16 – 27), which provide that **said process unit eliminates an element whose degree of significance is lower than a specific significance level and that said specific significance level differs with an attribute of said each element.***

19. **Regarding independent claim 50**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 20, and is rejected along the same rationale.

20. **Regarding independent claim 51**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 20, and is rejected along the same rationale.

21. **Regarding independent claim 1**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 20, and is rejected along the same rationale.

22. **Regarding dependent claim 2**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 21, and is rejected along the same rationale.

23. **Regarding dependent claim 3**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 22, and is rejected along the same rationale.

24. **Regarding dependent claim 4**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 23, and is rejected along the same rationale.

25. **Regarding dependent claim 5**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 24, and is rejected along the same rationale.

26. **Regarding independent claim 10**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 20, and is rejected along the same rationale.

27. **Regarding dependent claim 11**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 23, and is rejected along the same rationale.

28. **Regarding dependent claim 12**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 24, and is rejected along the same rationale.

29. **Regarding dependent claim 13**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 39, and is rejected along the same rationale.

30. **Regarding dependent claim 14**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 40, and is rejected along the same rationale.

31. Claims 6 – 9, 15 – 19, 25 – 28, 33, 34 and 41 – 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brobst et al. (US 6061700 A) as applied to claims 1 – 5, 10 – 14, 20 – 24, 29 – 32, 35 – 40 and 46 – 51 above, and further in view of Miyashita (JP 08255255 A).

32. **Regarding dependent claims 25 – 28, 33 and 34**, Brobst et al. illustrate in Fig 1 that **said output constraint information is set through a network** (Fig. 1.150). Brobst et al. do not explicitly teach **limits ... based on a predetermined page size and a predetermined number of pages of said output document**. However, Miyashita does teach that *in an importance detection part 210, the importance of each element composing a document is determined. In an element width calculation part 220, the height of each element is conformed to the height of a rectangular area, the width of*

*each element according to the height is calculated and the width of a sentence element is adjusted so that the lengths of all the elements may be matched with the lengths of all rectangular areas. In an element temporary arranging part 230, each element is successively arranged on the column of a prescribed rectangular area in order. In an arrangement adjusting part 240, the element arranged in each rectangular area is adjusted so that the element may be properly stored in each rectangular area by selecting an element for adjustment from the elements arranged in each rectangular area and performing adjustments by eliminating/deleting/dividing/reducing the part of the width of the element for adjustment, based on the importance for each element. Normally, the element with low importance is selected as the element for adjustment* (Constitution), which provide for **said process unit limits the element to be placed on said output document, based on a predetermined page size and a predetermined number of pages of said output document, which are specified by output constraint information, that said process unit limits the element to be placed on said output document so that a total space occupied by said plurality of selected elements on said output document is less than or equal to a space limit determined by the page size and the number of pages, that said process unit continues selecting the element until said total space exceeds said space limit, and eliminates a most-recently selected element from said output document, that said process unit continues selecting the element until said total space exceeds said space limit, and reduces a size of at least a part of said plurality of selected elements so that said total space becomes less than or equal to said space limit,**

and a **setting unit setting said output constraint information**. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the invention of Brobst et al. with that of Miyashita because such a combination would allow the users of Brobst et al. the benefit of *providing a document information display device arranging document information including characters, drawings and pictures, etc., within the limited area of a display device so that contents may be easy to be recognized and displaying the document information* (Purpose).

33. **Regarding dependent claim 6**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 25, and is rejected along the same rationale.

34. **Regarding dependent claim 7**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 26, and is rejected along the same rationale.

35. **Regarding dependent claim 8**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 27, and is rejected along the same rationale.

36. **Regarding dependent claim 9**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 28, and is rejected along the same rationale.

37. **Regarding dependent claims 41 and 42**, neither Brobst et al. nor Miyashita explicitly teach **keeping a text element and eliminating a non-text element**.

However, Miyashita does teach that *in an arrangement adjusting part 240, the element arranged in each rectangular area is adjusted so that the element may be properly stored in each rectangular area by selecting an element for adjustment from the elements arranged in each rectangular area and performing adjustments by eliminating/deleting/dividing/reducing the part of the width of the element for adjustment,*

Art Unit: 2176

*based on the importance for each element. Normally, the element with low importance is selected as the element for adjustment (Constitution). The skilled artisan would be motivated to modify the combined invention of Brobst et al. and Miyashita to provide that the specific significance level of a non-text element is higher than that of a text element, and that said process unit keeps a text element, and eliminates a non-text element, by providing the user with the option to set all of the non-text elements as having a higher or lower importance than the text elements in order to allow the user the option of a limited text or limited image conglomerate page because of the user's limited computing resources. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the invention of Brobst et al. with that of Miyashita because such a combination would allow the users of Brobst et al. the benefit of providing a document information display device arranging document information including characters, drawings and pictures, etc., within the limited area of a display device so that contents may be easy to be recognized and displaying the document information (Purpose).*

38. **Regarding dependent claims 43 and 44**, neither Brobst et al. nor Miyashita explicitly teach **compression method or rate**. However, Miyashita does teach that *in an arrangement adjusting part 240, the element arranged in each rectangular area is adjusted so that the element may be properly stored in each rectangular area by selecting an element for adjustment from the elements arranged in each rectangular area and performing adjustments by eliminating/deleting/dividing/reducing the part of the width of the element for adjustment, based on the importance for each element.*

*Normally, the element with low importance is selected as the element for adjustment (Constitution). The skilled artisan would be motivated to modify the combined invention of Brobst et al. and Miyashita to provide that **said process unit compresses a non-text element by using a compression method corresponding to the degree of significance of said non-text element**, and that **said process unit compresses a non-text element at a compression rate corresponding to the degree of significance of said non-text element**, since Miyashita teaches reducing and so that the skilled artisan can provide his users with a conglomerate page that a user with limited computing resources can output on his display without using a lot of memory. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the invention of Brobst et al. with that of Miyashita because such a combination would allow the users of Brobst et al. the benefit of *providing a document information display device arranging document information including characters, drawings and pictures, etc., within the limited area of a display device so that contents may be easy to be recognized and displaying the document information* (Purpose).*

39. **Regarding dependent claim 45**, neither Brobst et al. nor Miyashita explicitly teach **first and significance level**. However, Brobst et al. do teach that *how these attributes are processed depends on the relation criteria specified by the user... the user may specify a relation criteria that includes all URLs that have the FOLLOW attribute, excludes those that have a NOFOLLOW attribute, and excludes those that have a SHOULD FOLLOW attribute. In yet another alternative, URLs with a FOLLOW or SHOULD FOLLOW attribute are included in the conglomerate web page while the*

Art Unit: 2176

*URLs that have the NOFOLLOW attribute are expressly excluded (Column 10, lines 16 – 27), and Miyashita does teach that in an arrangement adjusting part 240, the element arranged in each rectangular area is adjusted so that the element may be properly stored in each rectangular area by selecting an element for adjustment from the elements arranged in each rectangular area and performing adjustments by eliminating/deleting/dividing/reducing the part of the width of the element for adjustment, based on the importance for each element. Normally, the element with low importance is selected as the element for adjustment (Constitution). The skilled artisan would be motivated to modify the combined invention of Brobst et al. and Miyashita to provide that **said process unit eliminates a text element whose degree of significance is lower than a first significance level, and compresses a non-text element whose degree of significance is lower than a second significance level**, since the skilled artisan can modify the combined invention to allow the user to set the text elements below the relation criteria to the *NOFOLLOW attribute* and the non-text elements below the relation criteria to the *SHOULD FOLLOW attribute* and compress the non-text elements so as to provide the user with a conglomerate page that a user with limited computing resources can output on his display without using a lot of memory, and making the user not feel as if he has limited resources. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the invention of Brobst et al. with that of Miyashita because such a combination would allow the users of Brobst et al. the benefit of *providing a document information display device arranging document information including characters, drawings and pictures, etc., within the**

*limited area of a display device so that contents may be easy to be recognized and displaying the document information (Purpose).*

40. **Regarding dependent claim 15**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 41, and is rejected along the same rationale.

41. **Regarding dependent claim 16**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 42, and is rejected along the same rationale.

42. **Regarding dependent claim 17**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 43, and is rejected along the same rationale.

43. **Regarding dependent claim 18**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 44, and is rejected along the same rationale.

44. **Regarding dependent claim 19**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 45, and is rejected along the same rationale.

### **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan Hillery whose telephone number is (703) 305-4502 until 10/19/2004 and (571) 272-4091 after 10/19/2004. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F, 6:30 a.m. - 3:00 p.m..


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (703) 305-9792 until 10/20/2004 and (571) 272-4090 after 10/20/2004. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.



Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

NH



**JOSEPH FEILD**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**